

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/533,177	ILYUSHENKO ET AL.	

  

<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
MICHAEL ABOAGYE	1793	

**All Participants:**

**Status of Application:** \_\_\_\_\_

(1) MICHAEL ABOAGYE. (3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(2) BRIAN L. STENDER. (4) \_\_\_\_\_.

**Date of Interview:** 5 March 2010

**Time:** 2:30 PM

**Type of Interview:**

Telephonic  
 Video Conference  
 Personal (Copy given to:  Applicant     Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated:  Yes     No

If Yes, provide a brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

*none*

Claims discussed:

*9 and 10*

Prior art documents discussed:

*none*

**Part II.**

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

**Part III.**

It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/M. A./  
 Examiner, Art Unit 1793

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Claims 9 and 10 were discussed, and agreement was reached between the Examiner and Applicant on the amendments reflected in the Examiner's Amendment. Said amended claims appear to better clarify the method steps of the claimed invention.